

REMARKS

Amendments

Amendments to the Claims

Applicant has amended the claims to more particularly point out what Applicant regards as the invention. Specifically, Applicant claims that the video stream is a Motion Pictures Expert Group (MPEG) video stream. In addition, Applicant claims that the I, P, and B frame are compressed according to an MPEG standard. Furthermore, Applicant claims scaling the I and P frames based on the predetermined portions of each B frame. No new matter has been added as a result of these amendments as these amendments are supported at page 5, paragraph 26 and page 6, paragraph 29.

Rejections

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-4 and 10-13

Claims 1-4 and 10-13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Mochida, U.S. Patent No. 6,462,744 (previously cited) and Persiantsev, U.S. Patent No. 7,158,681. Persiantsev qualifies as prior art only under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) based on its issue date. Applicant does not admit that Persiantsev is prior art and reserves the right to swear behind the reference at a later date. Nevertheless, Applicant respectfully submits that the combination does not teach each and every element as claimed in the claims 1-4 and 10-13.

Mochida discloses an onscreen data video display system that determines which portions of a B frame will be replaced by the location and size of the onscreen data, and discards those pre-determined portions before decoding the video. Mochida also discloses that the video are scaled using horizontal filters 71 and 72 (Figure 8) according to a scaling ratio. Thus, Mochida discloses scaling the video horizontally.

Persiantsev discloses performing vertical scaling of uncompressed video to fit the video information onto the display area provide by a television. A video processor receives uncompressed video that is the RGB color information for each pixel of each video frame. The video processor scales the video before compressing the video. A video

compressor compresses the scaled video using compression schemes known in the art, such as Moving Pictures Expert Group (MPEG) compression encoding. A video decompressor later decompresses the MPEG compressed video for display on a television.

Applicant's claimed decoding pre-determined portions of a compressed MPEG B frame, where the predetermined portions are determined by display resolution. The Examiner admits that Mochida does not disclose this claim limitation and relies on Persiantsev as disclosing it. However, Persiantsev merely discloses modifying the uncompressed video to a desired display resolution before compressing the modified video. Thus, Persiantsev cannot teach or suggest modifying portions of a compressed MPEG B frame based on display resolution. Therefore, Persiantsev cannot be properly interpreted as disclosing Applicant's decoding pre-determined portions a compressed MPEG B frame based on a display resolution as claimed.

Furthermore, Applicant claims that scaling the I and P frames based on the only predetermined portions of each B frame, while Mochida discloses only using scaling horizontally using a scaling ratio. In addition, because Persiantsev is directed to scaling uncompressed video, Persiantsev cannot teach or suggest scaling compressed video.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the combination of Mochida and Persiantsev cannot render obvious Applicant's claims 1-4 and 10-13. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of the rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over the combination.

Claims 5, 9, 14 and 15

Claims 5, 9, 14 and 15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Mochida, Persiantsev, and Reitmeier, U.S. Patent No. 4,622,577 (previously cited). Applicant respectfully submits that the combination does not teach each and every element of claims 5, 9, 14 and 15.

Reitmeier does not disclose decoding only portions of B-frames determined by display resolution as claimed. Because Mochida and Persiantsev do not teach or suggest this claimed element, the combination of Mochida, Persiantsev, and Reitmeier cannot render obvious Applicant's claims 5, 9, 14 and 15.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of the rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over the combination.

Claims 16, 21, 22 and 25

Claims 16, 21, 22 and 25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Mochida, Persiantsev, and Boyce, U.S. Patent No. 5,614,952 (previously cited). Applicant respectfully submits that the combination does not teach each and every element of claims 16, 21, 22 and 25.

Boyce does not disclose decoding only portions of B-frames determined by display resolution as claimed. Because Mochida and Persiantsev do not teach or suggest these claimed elements, the combination of Mochida, Persiantsev, and Boyce cannot render obvious Applicant's claims 16, 21, 22 and 25.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of the rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over the combination.

Claims 6, 17-20, 23 and 26-33

Claims 6, 17-20, 23 and 26-33 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Mochida, Persiantsev, Reitmeier and Boyce. Applicant respectfully submits that the combination of Mochida, Persiantsev, Reitmeier and Boyce does not teach or suggest each and every limitation of Applicant's claims 6, 17-20, 23 and 26-33.

None of the three references teach or suggest decoding only portions of B-frames determined by display resolution as claimed. Therefore, the combination cannot be properly interpreted as doing so.

Therefore, the combination of Mochida, Persiantsev, Reitmeier and Boyce cannot render obvious Applicant's claims 6, 17-20, 23 and 26-33, and Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of the rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over the combination.

Claims 8, 24 and 34

Claims 8, 24 and 34 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Mochida in combination of Official Notice that MPEG-2 is well known. However,

Mochida does not disclose each and every limitation of claims 8, 24 and 34, and the assertion of Official Notice cannot fill the gaps. Therefore, the combination cannot render obvious Applicant's claims 8, 24 and 34, and Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of the rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over the combination.

SUMMARY

Claims 1-34 are currently pending. In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that the pending claims are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the application and allowance of the pending claims.

If the Examiner determines the prompt allowance of these claims could be facilitated by a telephone conference, the Examiner is invited to contact Eric Repogle at (408) 720-8300 x258.

Deposit Account Authorization

Authorization is hereby given to charge our Deposit Account No. 02-2666 for any charges that may be due. Furthermore, if an extension is required, then Applicant hereby requests such extension.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR
& ZAFMAN LLP



Eric S. Repogle
Registration No. 52,161

Dated: June 12, 2007

1279 Oakmead Parkway
Sunnyvale, CA 94085-4040
(408) 720-8300 x258